

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A number of claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claims 8 and 22 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection thereof. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Claims 1 - 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,861,886 issued to Moran et al that describes a system for creating and manipulating groups of graphic objects using enclosures (at Abstract). In support of the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner specifically relied upon a number of figures including Figs. 5 - 8 and the associated description at column 5, lines 29 – 56, under the subtitle, "Operations on Enclosures" and "Altering Enclosures" at column 8 line 59 through column 9 line 20. In particular, at column 9, line 12, "Adding graphic objects to an enclosure is illustrated in FIGS. 7 – 8. Referring to FIG. 7, a pen stroke 701 touches enclosure 704 at a first point 702 and at a second point 703. This causes the pen stroke 701 to be treated as an alteration gesture so that the enclosure 704 is to be altered accordingly. In FIG. 7, the graphic objects "1 2" 705 are to be added to the group. Referring now to FIG. 8, when completed an enclosure 801 has been created which has the shape of the original enclosure 704 with the shape of the pen stroke 701 added as a "bump"."

Therefore, in the system of Moran, in order to "add" objects to a first group to form the new group, a new boundary is first created that must envelop the objects that are to be added to the first group. In other words, it is the new boundary that defines the new group. From the example above, in order to form a new group that includes the first group "A B C" and new objects "1 2", a new boundary (i.e., enclosure 801) must first be defined that envelopes both the first group ("A B C") and the objects to be added ("1 2"). This is done by creating the enclosure 704 using penstroke 701 touching points 702 and 703 to create enclosure 801. Only after the enclosure (801) has been defined, can the new group ("A B C 1 2") be created. This process is clearly delineated in FIGS. 7 and 8. According to Moran, group modification (either addition or subtraction, for example) is predicated solely upon boundary modification.

In contrast, claim 1 as amended describes a system for logically grouping entities in a graphical user interface whereby a group's associated boundary is modified based upon the group modification (i.e., addition or subtraction of elements of the group, for example). In other words, a particular group is modified in whatever manner deemed appropriate, it is only then that the new boundary is defined either contracting or expanding as appropriate.

For example, using the example of Moran, a new group “A B C 1 2” would be formed by simply adding the new objects “1 2” to the existing group “A B C” and a new boundary would be formed to accommodate the new group.

In particular, claim 1 recites,

“modifying the first group in response to moving a selected entity across said first associated boundary;  
**modifying the first associated boundary based upon the modified first group**”. (emphasis added)

At page 7, second paragraph of the instant Application,

“For instance if movement across a first associated boundary of a first group is from outside a boundary to within, then the logic modifies the first group by adding all objects of the selected entity which are not already part of the first group to the first group; **and expanding said first associated boundary to include all objects of the selected entity which were not already part of the first group.**” (emphasis added)

In this way, the invention as recited in claim 1 requires that any modification of the group is followed by an associated modification of the boundary in order to accommodate the new group. In other words, the boundary accommodates the new group whereas with Moran, it is the new group that accommodates the new boundary.

The Applicant believes, therefore, that Moran does not anticipate claim 1 and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the U.S.C. 102(b) rejection thereof.

Claim 16 has been amended along the lines as claim 1 and for at least the reasons stated above is also believed to be allowable over the cited art.

All dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and/or 16 are therefore also believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited above.

A number of claims were rejected as being unpatentable as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of Moran and a number of secondary references. Based upon the above remarks, the Applicant believes that none of the secondary references taken singly or in any combination with Moran render the invention unpatentable and therefore request that the Examiner withdraw the U.S.C. 103 rejection thereof.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-38 and new claims 39 – 53 are allowable over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are

sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J Ferrazano  
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778